**I negate. Resolved: In the United States, National service ought to be compulsory.**

I value morality because “ought” implies a moral obligation

Thus, the criterion is preserving self-ownership.

Prefer:

1.Self ownership is k2 acknowledging individual sovereignty

**Vallentyne** **02’** Vallentyne, Peter. "Libertarianism." Stanford University. Stanford University, 05 Sept. 2002. Web. 31 July 2016.

The **principle of** full **self-ownership** is attractive for many reasons. It **is a strong endorsement of** the **moral importance and the sovereignty of** the **individual, it expresses the refusal to treat people as interchangeable objects** (things that may be traded off for each other)**, and it seems to provide a clear and simple starting point for our thinking about justice.**

2. Autonomy is a necessary part of a good life

**Hassoun** Nicole Hassoun, Associate Professor of Philosophy at Birmingham University, comments in Arizona University’s 3rd International Conference on Philosophy: “Human Rights, Needs, and Autonomy” University of Arizona, ATINER 3rd International Conference on Philosophy

Consider, first, why autonomy (understood here as just requiring reasoning and planning ability) is necessary for a minimally good life. Rewarding struggle, deep understanding, good relationships, significant achievement, virtue and so forth are some of the things that make a life go minimally well. Each of these things requires autonomy. **People must be able to reason** about, make, and carry out simple plans on the basis of their commitments to create and maintain good relationships. People must, for instance, be able to reason about, make, and carry out plans to talk with their friends and families for their relationships to flourish. **Reasoning and planning are also necessary for developing important skills and character traits, deep understanding, significant achievement**, and so forth. **So, autonomy is necessary for a minimally good life**. Autonomy is also partly constitutive of such a life. This is because **personhood is**, partly **constitutive of a minimally good life and autonomy is** partly **constitutive of personhood.** Consider, first, why personhood is partly constitutive of a minimally good life. As persons we ‘have a conception of ourselves and of our past and future. We reflect and assess. We form pictures of what a good life would be, often, it is true, only on a small scale, but occasionally also on a large scale. And we try to realize these pictures’ (Griffin, 2006, Ch. 2). These **conditions for personhood are also conditions for a minimally good life.** To live a minimally good life one must be able to hope and dream, to pursue one’s goals and carry out projects, to live life on one’s own terms. Those who lack a conception of being a self, persisting through time, with a past and future cannot hope or dream. Those who never pursue their conception of a good life cannot achieve their goals or carry out projects. Hence personhood is partly constitutive of a minimally good life. Consider next why autonomy is partly constitutive of personhood. Recall that **autonomy requires the ability to reason**, make, and carry out simple plans **on the basis of one’s desires. These conditions** for autonomy **are also conditions for personhood.** To reflect and assess in the way that personhood requires one must be able to reason. To pursue one’s conception of a good life, as persons do, one must be able to make and carry out simple plans. We can also see that autonomy is necessary for and partly constitutive of a minimally good life via examples. Suppose Aefa drifts through life making one choice then another randomly or letting others choose for her. Suppose that Aefa has not freely chosen to drift. He simply [One who] cannot reason about, make, or carry out [her] plans. Aefa cannot shape his [her] own life. He does not choose consistently enough to [and cannot] attain most of the things he [one] desires. He may end up subject to another’s will. Even if, by chance, Aefa secures many valuable things, his [One’s] life will still lack an important kind of value. His life will be like a prize won accidentally (Raz, 1998). Aefa [One without autonomy] cannot live a minimally good life because his [her] life is not truly her own.

3. Autonomy is a pre-req to other frameworks. In order to pursue interest or desires, one must have the freedom to do so. Moreover, people must be able to choose what ethical principle is best in order to obey it. This makes autonomy necessary to access other moral principles.

**I contend that Compulsory National Service minimizes self-ownership**

**Contention 1: Free Will**

**Compulsory National Service violates free will by having the government control you**

**Hornsberger** **13’** Hornsberger, Jacob. (Founder and President of The Future of Freedom Foundation) "Destroying Freedom to Protect Freedom." Cato Unbound. Cato Institute, 16 Sept. 2013. Web. 27 July 2016.

**The ultimate issue for those who advocate government programs that involve the initiation of force is: Are you personally willing to support the government’s killing of those people who choose to violently resist when the government initiates force against them?** In his endorsement of mandatory military service for the American people, Pascal-Emmanuel Gobry, while touching on the issue of coercion, does not directly confront that central issue. So permit me to address the critical question to him directly. Let’s **assume that the Cato Institute has** just **hired an 18-year-old intern named Stephanie** Jones, a young woman who is passionately committed to libertarianism. **A couple of months after she’s hired, Stephanie receives a notice from the Department of Defense saying that she’ll have to resign** her position at Cato **to fulfill her mandatory commitment to the U.S. military. Stephanie** politely **refuses,** saying that as a free person she has decided to stay at Cato, not because she has any conscientious objection to serving in the military but simply because she doesn’t want to. **She prefers staying at Cato serving the cause of freedom.** Gobry spends a large part of his essay arguing the importance and benefits of military service. But that’s not the critical issue. We can concede his arguments in favor of military service. The real issues, however, are whether people should be forced to work in government programs no matter how their important and beneficial they are, and whether a society can be considered truly free when people are forced to do so. **For anyone who places a high value on freedom, there can be only one answer: Freedom entails the right of one to live** his **life any way** he **chooses so long as** he **doesn’t forcibly or fraudulently interfere with the right of other people to do the same. If people aren’t free to make their own peaceful choices in life, then there is no way that that they can be considered genuinely free.** Thus Cato’s 18-year-old intern, Stephanie Jones, has the moral right to say no when the military comes calling, regardless of her reasons, just as others have the right to say yes. **That’s what freedom is ultimately all about**. Neither the military nor Gobry has the moral authority to kill Stephanie for refusing to work for the military and instead choosing to remain employed at Cato. **The issue of** mandatory military service — or, for that matter, **mandatory service of any kind — ultimately involves the issue of sovereignty. Either the individual is sovereign over his life or the state is. Under what moral authority does a government seize a free person and compel him to serve the government or to serve others? How can people living in a society in which the state wields that sort of sovereignty over them be considered truly free?** Indeed, isn’t that what slavery is all about — the legal authority of some to force others to serve them?

Citizens are encouraged to do acts that benefit the community, compulsing them is contradictory

Chapman, Bruce. "A Bad Idea Whose Time Is Past: The Case Against Universal Service." The Brookings Institution. Brookings Institute, 01 Sept. 2002. Web. 27 July 2016.

**Trying to justify universal service on moral grounds is also a mistake, and a serious one. Morally, service isn't service to the extent it is compelled.** Involuntary voluntarism is like hot snow. And allowing the pay to approach (let alone surpass) that available to ordinary workers of the same age performing the same tasks as the stipended and officially applauded "volunteers" stigmatizes the private sector. (The military recruit of today is sometimes called a volunteer only because he is not conscripted. His service is more commendable morally than that of some other paid employee because he is prepared to risk his life.) **Universal service advocates such as Litan are on especially shaky ground when charging that citizens should be "required to give something to their country in exchange for the full range of rights to which citizenship entitles them." This cuts against the grain of U.S. history and traditions. Citizens here are expected to be law-abiding, and they are called to jury duty—and to the military if absolutely necessary. They are encouraged (not forced)** to vote and **to render voluntary service—which Americans famously do.** **But to require such service before the rights of citizenship are extended is simply contrary to the purposes for which the country was founded and has endured.** The Founders had a keen awareness of the ways that the state could tyrannize the people, and taking the people's liberty away to serve some specious government purpose unattached to national survival is a project that would horrify them. I also raise this practical question: exactly which citizenship rights will Litan deny those people who decline to perform government-approved national service? What will be done to punish the activist who thinks he can do more to serve humanity through a political party than through prescribed government service? Or the young religious missionary who would rather save souls than guard a pier for a few months? How about-at the other end of the virtue spectrum-the young drug dealer who is only too happy to help guard the pier? Will you keep him out of the service of his choice and compel him to do rehab as his form of "service"?

Outside of mass mobilization for war—or in the special case of Israel, a small nation effectively on constant alert—the only modern nations that have conscripted labor to meet assorted, centrally decreed social purposes have been totalitarian regimes. In those lands, the object, as much as anything, has been to indoctrinate youth in the morality of the state. Litan may not have such goals in mind, but many universal service advocates want to use conscription to straighten out the next generation—to their approved standards. No doubt many-most?-think they can inculcate a sense of voluntary service through compulsory service.

In reality, however, no previous generation of youth has been so encouraged to volunteer for various approved, state-sponsored social causes. In many high schools in the United States, students cannot get a diploma without performing a certain number of hours of approved "community service." Does a child who must perform service to graduate from high school develop a high sense of what it means to help others? Does a student who learns that almost anything counts toward the service requirement—so long as he doesn't get paid-develop a keen sense of civil calling? Or does he hone his skill at gaming the system? And why, if we have this service requirement in high school—and some colleges-do we need yet another one for the year after high school? Universal service (indeed any national service scheme that achieves demographic heft) is a case study in unintended consequences. One surprise for liberals might be a growing disillusionment with the government and the way it wastes money. Today's youth trust the government and are immensely patriotic, but bureaucratized service requirements could cure that. Another unintended consequence might be instruction in how government make-work is a tax on one's freedom and an irritating distraction from education goals and serious career development. Conservatives of a sardonic nature might come to appreciate the prospect of generations growing to adulthood with firsthand experience of government's impertinence. It would not be necessary thereafter to exhort the veterans of such unnecessary compulsion to resist the claims of government over the rest of their lives. **Universal service likewise would be an invitation to scandal.** The military draft was bad enough, dispatching the budding scientist to pick up paper on a base's roadsides and sending the sickly malcontent to deliver meal trays to patients in base hospitals. **People with powerful parents got cushy positions, while the poor got the onerous tasks. When labor is both free and abundant, it will be squandered and abused.** If that was true in aeras when mass armies were raised, what can one expect in a time when only a small fraction of the population is needed to operate our high-tech military?

**Therefore, Compulsory National Service Violates Free Will by forcing people to serve. Good deeds are encouraged not enforced. But forcing people to do what is right, destroys the very freedom we want to protect because freedom entails the right to live anyway we choose as long as it doesn’t interfere with other people. Which connects to my value criterion of Self-Ownership because without personal sovereignty and the ability to choose our choices, our freedom becomes determined by other people.**